Doc Code: AP.PRE.REO

Registration number

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

*Total of ______ forms are submitted.

PTO/SB/33 (07-05) Approved for use through 06/30/2008. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Telephone number

June 6, 2008

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number Docket Number (Optional) PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW 10233-701.201 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the Application Number United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for 10/681,821 10/07/2003 Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] June 6, 2008 by EFS First Named Inventor Anant V. HEGDE ET AL. Signature__ Art Unit Examiner Typed or printed 3762 J. STOKLOSA name Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

	\sim
I am the	
applicant/inventor.	Co Day
assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.	James R. Shay
(Form PTO/SB/96)	Typed or printed name
attorney or agent of record.	650.212.1700

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 Date NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

This collection of information in required by \$5 U.S.C. 1.32. The information is required to detain or retain a bound by the period which is 15 feet (and by the USFTO) to proceed an application. Confederably is presented by \$8 U.S.C. 1.22 and 75.FT 11.1, 1.14 and 14.5. This confederal is estimated to table 2, printed to complete including gallbring, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USFTO. Then will very depending upon the Individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you required to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this busders, should be sent to the Chief Individual Context. Any U.S. Petent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1469, Absoratios, VA 22313-1463. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO THAI Stop API, Commerce, P.O. Box 1469, Absoratios, VA 22313-1463.

FILED VIA EFS ON JUNE 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 10233-701.201

Confirmation No.:

6623

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appl. No. : 10/681,821

Anant V. HEGDE et al.

Filing Date :

Applicant

October 7, 2003

Title : Vascular Assist Device and Methods

3762

Group Art Unit: 376

Examiner : Joseph A. STOKLOSA

Docket No. : 10233-701,201

Customer No. : 66854

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

MailStop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to the Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program, Appellants submit these Arguments in support of Applicants' Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review, which is filed herewith, together with a Notice of Appeal from the Final Office Action dated April 30, 2008.

ARGUMENTS FOR REVIEW

In the Office Action dated April 30, 2008 (the "Final Office Action"), the Examiner acknowledged that claims 1-34, 36-39, 122-134 and 136-170 are pending and presented the following final rejection of the claims:

Claims 1-3, 9, 12, 14-17, 19-20, 26-27, 31, 36-39, 122, 136-139 and 143 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or § 103(a) over Easterbrook US 6,238,334 (Final Office Action, p. 2);

Claims 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 18, 28-30, 32-34, 140-142, 144-146, 159, 160, 169 and 170 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook (Final Office Action, p. 5);

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook in view of Walsh US 6,902,522 (Final Office Action, p. 9);

Claims 21, 128, 129 and 161-164 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook in view of Franchi US 6,030,335 (Final Office Action, p. 9);

Claims 123-127 and 130-134 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook in view of Freed US 5,169,379 (Final Office Action, p. 11); and

Claims 165-168 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook in view of Okuzumi US 6,587,734 (Final Office Action, p. 11).

The Final Office Action never states a ground of rejection for claims 22-25 and 147-158. Appellants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner clarify for purposes of this Appeal the status of these claims as being objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Alternatively, if the Examiner wishes to state grounds for rejection of these claims, Appellants respectfully request that the Examiner reopen prosecution to make the rejection(s).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2008

James R. Shay, Reg. No. 32,062

SHAY GLENN LLP 2755 Campus Drive, Suite 210 San Mateo, CA 94403

Telephone: 650.212.1700 Facsimile: 650.212.7562 CUSTOMER NO. 66854